

advances and the role it will play in a more united, cooperative Europe.

The ties between Portugal and the United States are deep and old. Expo '98 will be a celebration of these ties, a celebration of an old and valued friendship.

I urge my colleague to support this resolution, and thank all of those who have already supported this resolution.

□ 1100

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY] for his supporting remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 91.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should participate in Expo '98 in Lisbon, Portugal, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I do not intend to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for an explanation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, by this action we will be completing action on this matter, which had already passed the Senate. Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 is identical to the House Concurrent Resolution No. 91, which the House passed a few moments ago.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 22

Whereas there was international concern expressed at the Rio Conference of 1992 about conservation of the seas;

Whereas 1998 has been declared the "International Year of the Ocean" by the United Nations in an effort to alert the world to the need for improving the physical and cultural assets offered by the world's oceans;

Whereas the theme of Expo '98 is "The Oceans, a Heritage for the Future";

Whereas Expo '98 has a fundamental aim of alerting political, economic, and public opinion to the growing importance of the world's oceans;

Whereas Portugal has established a vast network of relationships through ocean exploration;

Whereas Portugal's history is rich with examples of the courage and exploits of Portuguese explorers;

Whereas Portugal and the United States have a relationship based on mutual respect, and a sharing of interests and ideals, particularly the deeply held commitment to democratic values;

Whereas today over 2,000,000 Americans can trace their ancestry to Portugal; and

Whereas the United States and Portugal agreed in the 1995 Agreement on Cooperation and Defense that in 1998 the 2 countries would consider and develop appropriate means of commemorating the upcoming quinquennial anniversary of the historic voyage of discovery by Vasco da Gama: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurrent), That the United States should fully participate in Expo '98 in Lisbon, Portugal, and encourage the private sector to support this worthwhile undertaking.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the two concurrent resolutions just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONCERNING HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY IN BURMA

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 274) concerning human rights and democracy in Burma and a United Nations General Assembly resolution, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 274

Whereas the military government of Burma, as a member of the United Nations, is obligated to uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and all other international human rights standards and conventions to which it is a signatory;

Whereas the ruling State Law and Order Restoration Council (hereinafter referred to as the "SLORC") in Burma has refused to recognize the results of the May 1990 elections, which the National League for Democracy, led by Aung San Suu Kyi, won by a landslide;

Whereas the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in March 1995 unanimously condemned the SLORC's refusal to "take all necessary steps towards democracy in light of those elections";

Whereas the United Nations Commission on Human Rights also expressed grave con-

cern about violations of fundamental human rights in Burma, including torture, summary and arbitrary executions, massive use of forced labor including forced portering for the military, abuse of women, political arrests and detentions, restrictions on freedom of expression and association, and oppressive measures directed at ethnic and religious minorities;

Whereas the United Nations Commission on Human Rights noted that most of the 1990 democratically elected representatives have been excluded from the SLORC's "National Convention" and concluded that the convention does not "appear to constitute the necessary steps towards the restoration of democracy";

Whereas Burma continues to be one of the world's leading sites of narcotics production and trafficking and, according to the United States State Department, production of opium nearly doubled in Burma since the SLORC took power in a violent coup in 1988;

Whereas, according to the State Department's International Narcotics Control Strategy Report of March 1995, the SLORC's antinarcotics efforts last year fell far short of the measures necessary to make serious progress against the drug trade, and in addition, the SLORC's lack of control over heroin-producing areas is due to the SLORC's allowing wide-ranging, local autonomy (to ethnic armies) in exchange for halting their active insurgencies against Rangoon;

Whereas the peace agreements signed by the SLORC with ethnic insurgencies since 1989 were supposed to lead to both a decrease in opium production and economic development, but according to the State Department's report, "neither development nor a reduction in opium cultivation has occurred";

Whereas in 1948 when Burma became independent, the annual production of opium was 30 tons, Burma was then a democracy, it exported rice to its neighbors and the world, and it enjoyed a free-market system;

Whereas today Burma is one of the poorest nations in the world and its opium production has increased some 8,000 percent to about 2,575 tons (1992-1993);

Whereas the drug production increase is the consequence in large degree of the inability of the successive military governments in Rangoon to come to terms with the country's ethnic minorities and the refusal of post-1962 military-dominated regimes to permit an open pluralistic society;

Whereas it is primarily through a democratically elected civilian government in Burma, supported by the Burmese people including the ethnic minorities, that Burma can make significant progress in controlling narcotics production and trafficking;

Whereas on July 10, 1995, the SLORC responded to international pressure, including 5 resolutions by the United Nations General Assembly, by releasing Aung San Suu Kyi, who had been held under house arrest for 6 years;

Whereas 16 elected Members of Parliament remain in detention in Burma, along with thousands of other political prisoners, according to Human Rights Watch/Asia, Amnesty International, and other human rights monitoring groups;

Whereas in July 1995 the International Committee of the Red Cross (hereinafter referred to as the "ICRC") closed its office in Burma due to the SLORC's refusal to agree to allow the ICRC confidential regular access to prisoners;

Whereas the United States ambassador to the United Nations visited Burma in September 1995, met with Aung San Suu Kyi, and also met with leaders of the SLORC and urged them to "choose the path" of "democracy, rather than continued repression and

dictatorial control," and declared that "fundamental change in the United States policy towards Burma would depend on fundamental change in the SLORC's treatment of the Burmese people; and

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Burma, Professor Yozo Yokota, visited the country in October 1995 and will deliver a preliminary report of his findings to the current session of the United Nations General Assembly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives calls on—

(1) the Burmese Government to immediately begin a political dialogue with Aung San Suu Kyi, other democratic leaders, and representatives of the ethnic minorities to release immediately and unconditionally detained Members of Parliament and other political prisoners, to repeal repressive laws which prohibit freedom of association and expression and the right of citizens to participate freely in the political life of their country, to resume negotiations with the International Committee of the Red Cross on access to prisoners, and help control the massive flow of heroin from Burma; and

(2) the President, the Secretary of State, and the United States ambassador to the United Nations to actively support and promote a resolution at the current session of the United Nations General Assembly reiterating the grave concerns of the international community and calling on the SLORC to take concrete, significant steps to fulfill its obligations to guarantee respect to basic human rights and to restore civilian, democratic rule to the people of Burma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Aung San Suu Kyi announced that her party, the National League for Democracy, would no longer participate in Slorc's sham constitutional convention. Suu rightly pointed out that her nation could never be expected to accept a constitution that was forced upon the convention participants by the military. It was very good to learn that our representatives at the U.N. refused this week to cosponsor a U.N. human rights resolution on Burma because it did not refer to the withdrawal, and subsequent expulsion, from the national convention of delegates from Suu Kyi's party.

Slorc demands that the constitution stipulates a leading role for the military in Burma's political process and would exclude anyone married to a foreigner from assuming the office of the president. Suu is married to an Oxford professor.

Slorc claims that her decision to boycott the convention is confrontation politics. Suu was right to point out that "what they have termed confrontational is that we have asked for dialogue, which we want in order to prevent confrontation. To silence the views of people whose opinions are different by putting them in prison is far more confrontational."

I am deeply concerned that a senior official of the Slorc in response to Suu's statement called Suu a traitor who should be annihilated. That sort of remark is not taken lightly by this committee.

Our Nation has very serious reasons to be concerned about what occurs in Burma and to Suu Kyi. High on our priority is the illicit drug production that has had a devastating impact on our cities, families and schools. In 1948 when Burma became independent, the annual production of opium was 30 tons. Burma was then a democracy, it exported rice to its neighbors and the world, and it enjoyed a free-market system. It was known as the "rice bowl" of Asia. Today, Burma is one of the poorest nations in the world and its opium production has increased some 8,000 percent to about 2,575 tons in 1992-1993.

What is the reason for this massive increase? Bertil Litner, the Burma reporter for the Far East Economic Review, states in his book "Burma in Revolt," that Burmese drug production is the consequence of:

The inability of successive governments in Rangoon to come to terms with the country's ethnic minorities and the refusal of post-1962 military-dominated regimes to permit an open, pluralistic society.

Unfortunately, some U.S. officials have taken the position that the human rights problem should be kept separate from the drug problem. What these officials have failed to recognize is that the human rights problem is directly linked to the drug production. As Bertil Litner points out, the majority of the opium grown in Burma is grown so that ethnic minorities can protect themselves.

While their leaders are not angels, it is very difficult to grow anything else in those regions and they need the money for arms. Until they feel confident that a representative form of government is established in Rangoon, they will continue to grow opium just like they have for the past 40 years.

A democratic Burma led by Suu Kyi and the other members of parliament elected and thrown into prison in 1990, will help us to resolve the Burmese drug production problem that is spiraling out of control. Threatening Suu Kyi and her democratic followers threatens our Nation's efforts in the drug area.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 274.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HAMILTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend and chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], for bringing this resolution before the House. It is a timely statement of our opposition to repressive measures practiced by the Government

of Burma and to Burma's continued failure to address the grave drug trafficking problem in a serious manner.

I believe it is important that this committee and this Congress speak up for political freedom and human rights whenever they are threatened. The United States should not, and will not, turn a blind eye toward political repression or a violation of fundamental human rights in Burma or anywhere else in the world.

Unfortunately, the people of Burma are governed by a ruthless military regime that has no understanding of the concepts of freedom or liberty or of individual rights. That is why it is important for the Congress to send a strong and unambiguous signal that clearly places the United States on the side of the Burmese people and their aspirations for democracy and human rights.

Similarly, this committee should reiterate its strong support for a vigorous attack on the very serious problem of drug trafficking.

House Resolution 274 calls on the Government of Burma to take concrete and effective action to control the massive flow of heroin from Burma. In this context, I also believe it is important for the United States to continue to support alternative development activities being conducted by the United Nations drug control program in the principal opium growing areas of Burma.

Given the limited contact we can and should have with the State Law and Order Restoration Counsel, or SLORC, I believe that these efforts have the best chance of impacting opium production in Burma at this time.

I urge the support of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 274, the resolution concerning Burma and the U.N. General Assembly that this body is considering today is both important and timely. Recent developments have heightened tension in Burma. Burma's democratic opposition leader Aung Sang Suu Kyi recently announced that she and her party, the NLD, would boycott the national constitutional convention organized by Burma's military junta, the SLORC. SLORC responded by expelling the NLD from the convention, thus foreclosing any chance for dialog between the Government and the opposition. Without dialog between the democratic opposition and the SLORC the prospects for democracy and stability in Burma are bleak. Clearly, conditions in Burma are once again on a downward spiral.

This Member commends the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the House International Relations Committee, for his

tireless efforts in promoting democracy in Burma and other parts of Asia and, specifically, for his initiative in drafting this resolution. House Resolution 274 addresses the human rights and narcotics problems in Burma in a constructive way. This Member hopes that Burma's generals understand that the Congress of the United States wants to promote cooperative ties between our two countries, but that would only be possible if they take effective action to expand human rights and democracy in Burma and to clamp down on Burma's massive opium production.

The Committee on International Relations unanimously approved House Resolution 274 on December 14. This Member understands the administration has no objections to the resolution as amended and approved by the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific and the Committee on International Relations, which I chair.

This Member urges all of our colleagues to support House Resolution 274.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution which urges the governing State Law and Order Restoration Council to open a dialog with Aung San Suu Kyi and her National League for Democracy, release all political prisoners, repeal laws limiting freedom of association and expression, and help control the flow of heroin from Burma.

I commend Ambassador Madeleine Albright for her tremendous work on this issue. I encourage all Members to support the work of our U.N. Representative as she relentlessly pursues the cause of Burmese democracy leader Aung San Suu Kyi. Ambassador Albright had a great meeting in Burma this fall with Aung San Suu Kyi.

I join Ambassador Albright's endorsement of the recent U.N. resolution which urges the Government of Burma to cease its violations of internationally recognized human rights.

The United States did not cosponsor the U.N. resolution because it did not focus on several specific problem areas that must be recognized. Additionally, the U.N. resolution fails to take into account the impact of recent developments in Burma that have given us cause for great concern. It is imperative that the SLORC understand that the United States and the international community will not tolerate threats or actions that suppress the advancement of the democratic movement in Burma.

The bill before us today sends a message to the SLORC that is consistent with Ambassador Albright's policy.

I would like to caution Members of the risks we take by treating Burma in

the same manner as we handled South Africa under its former regime. We need to weigh the merits of isolating Burma, prohibiting trade or investment, denying access to international capital flows, and employing economic pressures to force the current military regime, SLORC, to act according to our wishes.

We need to keep in mind that the United States economic role in Burma is limited. And, while I support efforts to employ what leverage we have to our advantage, I insist that we use it wisely.

□ 1115

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] for his strong support of democracy in Burma. I know the gentleman has traveled to Burma. He was instrumental in helping to gain the release of Aung San Suu Kyi from house arrest, and we commend the gentleman for his efforts and thank him for his participation in this debate.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution. House Resolution 274, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING AUTHORITIES UNDER MIDDLE EAST PEACE FACILITATION ACT OF 1994

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2808) to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until March 31, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2808

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 583(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), as amended by Public Law 104-47, is amended by striking "December 31, 1995" and inserting "March 31, 1996".

(b) CONSULTATION.—For purposes of any exercise of the authority provided in section 583(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236) prior to January 10, 1996, the written policy justification dated December 1, 1995, and submitted to the Congress in accordance with section 583(b)(1) of such Act, shall be

deemed to satisfy the requirements of section 583(b)(1) of such Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2808 temporarily extends the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994, which otherwise will expire on December 31, 1995.

That act was previously extended by Public Law 104-17, by Public Law 104-22, by Public Law 104-30, and by Public Law 104-47. H.R. 2808 extends the act until March 31, 1996, and includes a transition provision to permit the President to immediately exercise the authorities granted him by this extension.

Obviously, there have been a number of temporary extensions of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act. We had anticipated that the most recent extension would be the last, because a new Middle East Peace Facilitation Act was included in the conference report on the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, H.R. 1868, and we expected that bill to be enacted into law by now. Regrettably, that bill has been stalled because of a disagreement over an unrelated matter, and we are now confronted by the need to once again extend the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994.

This temporary extension was requested by the State Department, and I am not aware of any objection to it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HAMILTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for bringing the bill before the House and to let him know that I give my full support to it. I would prefer that we had in place at this time the 18 month new Middle East Peace Facilitation Act that is part of the foreign operations conference report already approved by the House. I think a longer term MEPFA would strengthen the peace process.

Unfortunately, because another item in that conference report remains in disagreement with the other body, we need to move yet another short-term extension of the existing law at this time.

I also want to note that adopting this bill today and enacting the full 1 month MEPFA is the best possible way to pay tribute to the memory of Prime Minister Rabin and to support the quest for peace that Prime Minister Perez described here last week.

Prime Minister Perez, when he was here last week, specifically and strongly endorsed MEPFA as important to